

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 Loop Road
Thursday, January 13, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, January 13, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball; William Lester; Steve Darcangelo and Doug Beachel

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tim Frateschi, Attorney to the Planning Board; William Massaro, Belgium Cold Springs Fire Department; David Voorhees; Dough Reith, CNY Land Surveying; Tim Swan; Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies; John Bianchi; Rick Edwards; Greg Sgromo, Dunn & Sgromo; Joe Nanna; Christina Nanna and Karen Rice, Clerk to Planning Board

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

APPOINTMENTS:

William Lester, Deputy Chairman

RESOLUTION #1 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board appoint **William Lester, Deputy Chairperson** to act on behalf of the Chairman if he is unable or has a conflict of interest for the 2022 calendar year for the 2022 calendar year.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Lester thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve.

Al Yager, Engineer to the Planning Board

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board appoint to the **Allen Yager, Engineer** to the Planning Board for the 2022 calendar year.

5 Aye s -- 0 Noes

Mr. Yager thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve.

Timothy Frateschi, Attorney to the Planning Board

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board appoint **Timothy Frateschi, Esq., Baldwin, Sutphen & Frateschi, PLLC**, attorney to the Planning Board for the 2022 calendar year.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Frateschi thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve.

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:00 p.m.

1. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2021—009

Whitney, Richard
8444 Oswego Road

The Public Hearing opened at 7:30 p.m.

Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying, represented the applicant stating that he has approximately 39 acres. Most recently the adjacent parcel, formerly owned by the Town, was transferred to Mr. Whitney and has been incorporated in. He is subdividing out a ten (10) parcel out of the

combination of his existing property and the property recently acquired. The existing home is serviced by public water with a septic system.

Hugh Kimball questioned if there is significant access on either side of the ten (10) acre parcel.

Mr. Reith stated that there's not supposed to be any access off of Hencle Boulevard, but there is enough room for access to the north, there is a significant drop-off on the other side.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:05 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the December 9, 2021 Planning Board meeting minutes.

RESOLUTION #4 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the December 9, 2021 Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2021—009

Whitney, Richard
8444 Oswego Road

There is a letter on file dated January 13, 2022, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the map for the above referenced minor subdivision prepared by CNY Land Surveying, dated January 3, 2022. Overall it appears that the proposed subdivision conforms to all applicable Town Code requirements as presented. I would have no objections to the Planning Board approving the proposed subdivision at this time.

The application was forward to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation that will be made part of the public record, in part:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Onondaga County Planning Board has determined that said referral will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide implications and may be acted on solely by the referring Board.

FINDINGS:

An environmental assessment indicates that this action will not result in any significant or adverse environmental impacts.

This action is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

This action is consistent with the Town's current zoning ordinances.

This application was forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Agency who made the following determination:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Onondaga County Planning Board has determined that said referral will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide implications and may consequently be acted on solely by the referring Board.

RESOLUTION #5 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing having been held and there being no findings or grounds for decision contrary to the laws and regulations of the Town of Lysander, County of Onondaga or State of New York, Final Plat approval for a two (2) lot subdivision application by Richard Whitney, for property located at 8444 Oswego Road, Part of Farm Lot No. 68 and Tax Map No. 055-03-10.1, as shown on a made dated January 3, 2022, prepared by Douglas Reith, CNY Land Surveying, is hereby approved.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #6 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

RESOLVED, that in granting a subdivision to Richard Whitney, for property located at 8444 Oswego Road, Baldwinsville, New York, the Planning Board invokes its right to impose a fee of \$250.00 per lot for one (1) lot in lieu of land for the development of parks, playgrounds, recreation or open land areas in the Town.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

All fees associated with this application are paid.

State law states that the applicant shall file the final plat in the Onondaga County Clerk's office within sixty-two (62) days from the date of final approval or such approval shall expire. The applicant shall also file one copy of the final plat in the Lysander Clerk's office.

Mr. Reith thanked the Board for their time.

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 2. Site Plan Review—Reschedule Hearing | B & F Development |
| Case No. 2020-001 | 3285 Belgium Road |

Greg Sgromo, Dunn & Sgromo Engineers, represented B & F Development, stating that they're before the Board with additional information to comments made previously and to see the status of how to proceed.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that we've been receiving updated material all week. We are in the process of reviewing that. Al Yager, Town Engineer, has been working on his review. Tonight, we would like to give each member of the Board an opportunity to express their issues or concerns that they may have to you, if they desire to do so. The Plan right now would be to complete our review and after you listen to our discussion, hopefully we might see some new submissions of material before our February meeting. In any event, we would be doing the SEQR at the February meeting and if things look promising we will schedule the Public Hearing for February following the SEQR. That is our intention at this point. At this time, I'd like to offer any member of the Board who wishes to make any comments or express any concerns at this point.

Steve Darcangelo stated that in reading the environmental package, there was a comment about public transportation, it was stated that there's no public transportation within a certain vicinity. Would there be any interest and should a facility like this start to consider discussions with Centro to see whether or not that would be worthwhile.

Mr. Sgromo stated that we'd be happy, if the Board desires, to send a letter to Centro.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he doesn't know if the Board does, but I bring it up because there's a little bit more development there with the apartments on the opposite side of Route 31. I think there is a STOP at Willett.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that he believes they discontinued it.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that that may be because of demand but was just wondering if the discussion would be worthwhile at this point.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they have no objection to reaching out if the Board would like us to do so.

William Lester stated that he has a bit of concern about the appraisal. Many of the comments from the existing Radisson residents involve a loss of value of their single family residential homes across Drakes Landing from the apartments; and I've reviewed the (unclear)...to conclude that one of the conclusions was that apartment dwellings either don't change the value of single family homes, in fact some even improve the value. My concern was that the comparison that was used was homes that are in an area near the apartments, but those homes that were in that study were valued anywhere from \$120,000 to stretching \$200,000; and then it looked at homes that are no where near apartments but also about that same value and concluded that there's no change. I find that a little hard to believe that that comparison (unclear) apples to oranges because the homes across Drakes Landing are anywhere from \$400,000 to \$600,000 and I find it kind of hard to believe the apartments will add value. I don't have a crystal ball to say that they will lose value, but that is certainly a concern that a \$600,000 homeowner feels.

Mr. Sgromo stated that he's not qualified to answer that question or the methodology.

Mr. Lester stated that it is bound to come up at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Sgromo stated something to the affect of getting the question from the Board in writing for a response and continued stating that he can't answer that question as far as that goes, but from a community planning standpoint, one of the beauties of Radisson is the diversity; the character of its residents, neighborhood, that sort of thing...diversity. I've worked in Radisson on various segments of it for the last thirty (30) years at some stage or form and just seeing it developed, whether it's apartments or whether it's single family residents across the street; we've been involved in it. Again, one of the nice things about Radisson is the diversity with different types of housing. How that plays into appraisals and that sort of thing, I don't know, but we will be happy to get an answer to your question if you'd like.

Tim Frateschi, Attorney to the Planning Board, posed a question to Mr. Lester, asking in what context are you asking that question. Is it being asked in an environmental context, from a SEQR review context or...

Mr. Lester stated that the value of the property could decline and that's a concern of many of the residents.

Mr. Frateschi stated that he understands that that's a concern of many of the residents. The issue of what is allowed in that zoning, which includes apartments, presumes that that would be an allowed use and as a result of that we don't generally look at that issue. I know, I was surprised to see that there was an opinion from the applicant, as we don't generally look at that issue. I was surprised to see that there was an opinion that talks about appraisal, talks about the fact that an apartment would not devalue homes around the area. I just want to understand the context of the question so that I can formulate in my mind how that is a SEQR issue if it is a SEQR issue.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that regardless of whether a parcel is being developed in accordance with the Zoning; if the development were to have some sort of almost, not predictable, but foreseeable large negative impact on a value, would it not be good planning to at least consider that? I'm not talking about this specific case, but as a Planning Board, would it not be relevant as a consequence in regards to planning.

Mr. Frateschi stated that first of all that is a very difficult concept to prove; but secondly the general rule, and I haven't done a lot of research on this specific issue recently, but my understanding of the general rule is that the underlying zoning the Town Board and, in this case, Radisson has determined was an allowable use; presumes that that use is not going to have a significant impact in terms of the value of that or devaluation. That all goes into the zoning scheme that is being developed.

Mr. Darcangelo concurred stating that that's a level for the next Board.

Mr. Frateschi concurred stating that that is not something we generally look at.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated that this Board is reviewing whether or not it is an applicable use of the property as it's zoned. Consequences should be and were considered by the Town Board.

Mr. Frateschi concurred, stating that he's not something you shouldn't consider, I'm just saying I'm trying to figure out where in the context of SEQR that would be considered.

Mr. Corey stated that his guess would be that it showed up in their response letter because that response letter was aimed at trying to answer issues raised by the citizens and that was one that was raised. Whether it's applicable to this Board and it's SEQR activity, personally I don't think it is.

Mr. Sgromo stated that the instructions from the developer to us was to provide any information we can to the Board to answer as many questions as possible so that the neighbors understand maybe how the impacts are considered...not necessarily that they don't weigh into SEQR one bit, but questions were asked and questions for the Town to grapple with. We're sensitive to that. We want to be good neighbors. I think we started their other project at least twenty (20) years ago. I think they have been good neighbors to the Town and they don't want to be anything but; so, if there's a question we can answer we're going to try to answer it correctly. If there's an accommodation that makes sense as far as a site planning stuff that we can do,

we're going to do it. We're not firm and hard in anything; there are certain things that just make sense to be a certain way, but we're open for discussion for anything.

Doug Beachel stated that he doesn't have any concerns. I think the project meets the zoning requirements. It's a mixed use development in part of a PUD that has been there for 50 years. There are apartments throughout scattered on various densities over any acreages and this is consistent with many of those, so, I think it meets the criteria

Hugh Kimball stated that he doesn't want to belabor that point anymore other than to make the point that two of us at least, part of our concern, which is environmental involve traffic and density based on the size of the project, which there are neighbors that are concerned because of the size. I don't have a question with whether you should not build apartments, my concern is how big and how many. I think you tried to fill every bit of the spot that you can with apartments, garages, parking lots, etc... with no open space even though the documents says there's 47% but it's not usable that I can see. It's a hill, it's a wetland and its parking lots, I'll leave it at that, I do also have a question for Al Yager or the Fire Department on page 3 of the December 9, 2021 meeting minutes there were questions there were questions that were raised and Mr. Mr. Marsallo stated that he would certainly review with Al and give him our feedback and I guess I'd be interested in what you have to say about the turn radius's and whether or not the Fire Department's trucks can get the ladders up to the top of the roof, etc...

Bill Marsallo stated that they still have concerns. We have received copies of the drawings; we've been reviewing them with the Fire Department and Al. We've made some recommendations; a letter is coming; we weren't able to get it prior to this meeting but you'll probably have it within the next day or two with our recommendation to add some additional hydrants if you're able to do that. The curbing is a concern. I don't think it takes into account snowbanks and at least doesn't take enough into account for snow banks and cars that park irregularly as a result of that. So, we do remain stern, we'd like to see those curbs lessened and paved for those areas. We've shared this with Al in an informal response.

Mr. Kimball concurred with the comment with regard to snow removal and questioned if it would be hauled away if it's necessary.

Mr. Sgromo stated that some great points are being raised and if you don't mind I'd like to elaborate on some of those. Unlike Riverknoll or Timber Banks, the site here is designed so that there is immediate access to three sides of each facility for fire engines, they can come in on any three sides of the buildings; which far exceeds Code requirements and yes, they can reach the roof, just like they can reach the rooves at Timber Banks, roughly the same size of building that we have here, but they don't have the same access. Snow storage comes down to the end of these aisles and there will be snow storage here (indicating on plan). Winter in Central New York, we've all lived it. We are aware of the comments from the fire department. We can absolutely accommodate fire hydrants wherever they like without a problem.

Driveway aisles, curbing that may be problematic, etc... were discussed.

Mr. Sgromo stated that we can take out curbing that may be problematic. The islands around the garages cannot be taken out because they're there for protection from people backing up. We'll find a balance there somewhere. I don't see any problem finding a balance with the fire department. Any changes will be fairly minor and straight forward, probably stuff nobody will ever even notice. We are committed to working with you, not an issue at all. With regard to traffic, the previous project proposed seven (7) buildings, we had a traffic study done for those seven (7) buildings. We have received NYS approval for impacts. The new study drops all of those impacts a bit because there is a reduced number of units with less traffic coming out. The changes are very minor, less than what they were on the previous plan now with this one building gone. Traffic has been a discussion but honestly there's significant capacity there. This is probably pretty close to the end of additional traffic utilizing this area.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that his concern here is your morning peak is lower than your afternoon peak; I don't know why, I'm sure it's justified but the biggest concern I have is the potential of queuing up past the entrance from the other side, morning wise, and the reason I say morning is because it's a left hand turn for them and now if they start to queue up into the neighborhood, we know what people do, they start to be more risky in their effort to get out into the roadway for with the chance of an accident to occur. We don't know that this study has specifically looked at how deep the queue might be in the morning.

Mr. Sgromo stated that it calculates it in there, I think there was a minimal chance of it coming up to Oak Brook here. If we go back in memory, the original driveway entrance was shifted to significantly reduce those conflicts there(indicating on plan).

Mr. Darcangelo stated that that's the concern that comes to my mind right away for traffic. You're increasing traffic there; the roads can handle the traffic; the question is whether or not the configuration of roadways allows for an easy transition of everyone getting from the neighborhood onto the feeders and onto the main road.

Mr. Sgromo stated that if they can convince the DOT to give us a second or two additional on this light that would alleviate that problem. It's very difficult to do because this is a major, major route.

Mr. Lester questioned if they had been approached.

Mr. Sgromo concurred stating 1 1/2 years ago.

Mr. Lester questioned if there has been any word.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they're in agreement with the traffic study that was prepared.

Mr. Frateschi stated that the queueing up to Oak Brook Road is a concern?

Mr. Darcangelo concurred.

Mr. Sgromo stated that if it happens, it's going to happen, but during a couple of cycles of this in the morning, peak 15 to 20 minutes...

Mr. Frateschi questioned the distance between NYS Route 31 and this portion of Oak Brook.

Mr. Yager stated that he believes it's just under 190' to the southern edge of pavement.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned how many vehicles is 200'?

Mr. Sgromo stated almost 10 vehicles.

Mr. Kimball asked to be permitted to give a little bit of history of Drakes Landing by reading the following statement:

Drakes Landing was designed as a two-lane collector road with no driveways for its entire length and no stop signs from Route 31 until the intersection with Willett Parkway nearly two miles in. The purpose of the design was to facilitate the egress to and ingress from Route 31 for those who live in the residential areas of Radisson. **Situating two busy driveways on Drakes Landing near the 31 intersection appears to be inconsistent with the design and purpose of the road.**

In 2007 Barton and Loguidice serving as Town Engineer produced a document on Evaluation of Land Use Change in the Radisson PUD for the Town's Ad-Hoc Committee including the importance of "recognizing potential environmental **impacts** of proposed land uses relative to natural resources, infrastructure improvements and **the functional hierarchy of the proposed street system.**" Clearly the increased population in Radisson over the past fourteen years has made any major changes in the PUD even more complex than in 2007.

Further Town Code Section 270-13 indicates that "where the center line of local streets opening into opposite sides of a collector street are within 200 feet of each other, they shall be made to coincide by curling or angling the local streets." With the present proposal this seems impossible because of the wetland on one end of the area and the proximity of the eastern entrance of Oak Brook Road to Route 31. Yet we are asked to approve a very large project with two driveways that would create a third and fourth point of **impact** between the two entrances of Oak Brook and allow more vehicles onto Drakes Landing than most of the intersections on the less busy portions of Drakes.

The size of the proposed development means that these two driveways would likely handle as much traffic as many of the roads that access Drakes Landing, and the location of these driveways is in a 45 mph zone. There appears to be an inherent danger to drivers going south on Drakes and drivers trying to access Drakes from Oak Brook with drivers on Drakes having to look left to Drakes, right to one and then right again to the second apartment driveway, and then

again left to Drakes. The same risks would appear to happen in reverse during the evening rush hour.

The proposed size of the project and the problems it may present to Radisson drivers will not, in my opinion, be overcome by turn lanes or tweaking the length of traffic light cycles at the intersection. We have received communications from at least 50 Radisson residents most of which cite traffic as one of their concerns.

Mr. Sgromo stated that if you'd like them to respond in more detail in writing they can. I can assure you that putting access across from each other has benefits, but what we don't want to do is put them closer to each other. If the numbers were higher, they're not that high, they're really not, the numbers coming out of that driveway are nothing compared to any kind of a retail establish half the size of one of those buildings. With that being said, the studies that were done and the length (unclear) every movement in the area here is an A. It's a straight up A, not even close to a B. So, they're so far apart I don't see a conflict. The level of service, all of these are A. In the grand scheme of things, the limited amount of time that this has any conflicts from that intersection is really minimal. It is minimal. Traffic is one of those things that everyone has an opinion on, in my opinion, based on...

Mr. Darcangelo stated that it's more than an opinion, it's something that impacts everyone. They might have an opinion too but it's going to impact those who do live there.

Mr. Sgromo stated that everything impacts, whether it's a significant impact is a different matter. We go by science, ITE, standards that are utilized, capacity manuals, industry standards, analysis, etc... It becomes more of a perception now. When these residents moved into Oak Brook there was nothing across the street, less development down Drake's, as traffic increased absolutely. Was that all in the planning of the whole Radisson Community, absolutely. This isn't the YMCA with a hundred cars coming in to go work out at 7:00-8:00 in the morning. It's a residential development with some people going to work, some people being empty nesters, home retired, whatever... It's easily quantifiable; it's easily analyzed and its industry standard stuff. I'm not going to sit here and say someone's perception is wrong because it's their perception. Other than that, it's all engineering.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he doesn't know the legitimacy of stating the parkway was built with the intention of no driveways, maybe it was, maybe it wasn't. I guess my question would be then, if that was the case, and the concern is a driveway, there's plenty of road should the driveways be designed in a matter more like a road, meaning they have wider entrances so that cars turning in can do it more freely and not having to have to come to a full stop. I don't know if that has any merit but maybe that should be considered because I don't think that's much of an...

Mr. Yager stated that the access in to the sight is actually wider than our Town standards.

Mr. Sgromo stated that we try, we're not perfect, but we try.

Mr. Darcangelo continued stating that while it may be a driveway in definition in that it serves one parcel, it functions as a road. Their first stop is approximately 180' in or something like that.

Mr. Yager concurred, actually over 200'. With regard to the Town Code standards of 200' off-sets for intersections there's certainly room to put a horizontal curb in here (indicating on plan) if the Board would desire that. The other option would be a no left hand-turn movement on the out-bound driveway that could be a consideration.

Mr. Sgromo stated that when you do these things you have to balance safety with aesthetics. We try, we're not perfect, but we try.

Considerable discussion with regard to traffic concerns and alleviation remedies, trip generations from apartments being lower than trip generations from single family houses were discussed.

Mr. Kimball questioned if Mr. Yager would like to talk about aesthetic resources and visibility of the buildings and so forth.

Mr. Yager stated that the bottom line is the buildings closest to Drakes are going to be about 48' tall from finished floor elevation, so you're up 51' above existing grade. We've all driven Drakes Landing, those trees or what's going to be left of the trees is not 50' tall. These buildings will be very visible from west bound traffic on Route 31 and by anybody traversing Drakes Landing. They will be visible from Route 31 east bound traffic as well. Now that's not to say that there aren't other three-story buildings in Radisson, however the collector roads in Radisson have typically been designed to shield the view of residential structures from the collector roads. That's why there is a berm on the south side of 1 shielding the Riverknoll apartments that are there. Aesthetic natural resources are a priority as identified in the Radisson's General Project Plan. All of the other buildings along Drakes Landing are two-story or less and most of them have a significant amount of screening between the road and the residential development. That's not to say that...I don't want the Board to just take that information that I'm saying and saying that I'm steering you, but that is one of the issues that comes up in SEQR that you should be concerned with and specifically Radisson's GPP objective number 5...conservation of the natural environment from a viewshed perspective.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they supplied cross sections for screening. These trees are at 40 to 50 foot tall. What we try to do at this scale is supplement with new trees.

Different computer generated viewsheds from different areas were reviewed.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they're trying to minimize any disturbance along here (indicating on plan) where retaining walls are proposed so that we don't dig into existing vegetation any more than we absolutely have to. We show some trees. My suggestion, what we did at Township 5 where apartments are being built up against a single family residential area, we picked certain spots. We'll be happy to walk out there with somebody during construction and see where you believe trees are required. We're perfectly happy supplementing trees...new trees, evergreens, insidious, whatever makes sense. What I don't recommend is a berm and the reason for that is we'll have to take out vegetation that is already existing and pretty mature. You build a berm and you start with some new trees but it's going to be along time before they offer as much buffering as these here do (indicating on plan). The proposed apartments are the same scale, same size building as Timber Banks. As you drive down River Road you will see those buildings very clearly, very easily with a different aesthetic buffer. However, here we'll do what we can to preserve the existing aesthetic buffer and supplement it as it makes sense. There are some ash trees that are dying and replace them with new evergreen or maples, whatever makes sense.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned how tall the existing mature trees were.

Mr. Yager stated that there are a few touching 45', 30' are the majority. Quite a few ash that are dead or died last year.

Mr. Sgromo stated that those should be removed with new, good trees put in their place.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that there's not much room because we have a bio-swale here (indicating on plan) and due to the limits of grading.

Mr. Sgromo showed areas proposed to be preserved.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that it will be interesting to be able to answer the question, how tall does vegetation need to be from the roadway looking up? I'm not seeing 51'.

Mr. Sgromo stated that if you're walking your eyesight is at 5 +/- feet...we can provide that. That would be a very useful diagram for the Board to have.

Mr. Darcangelo concurred adding that it would be nice to have as it would be helpful to understand the landscaping plan you select, how many years it might take before you're starting to see 40, 50, 60 to 100 percent loss of that scape.

Mr. Sgromo stated that we're not going to see 50' trees that we plant today.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that they don't need to be 50'.

Mr. Sgromo stated that it's deceiving to perceive how tall a tree actually is, if you've ever been out in the field where you had to measure them. It's amazing how tall a tree actually is. We'll provide that.

Mr. Darcangelo suggested providing it from the two lanes of NYS Route 31, Drakes Landing and the walking path to see how tall some things would have to be.

Mr. Sgromo concurred stating to keep in mind that these are still residential buildings Everything is residential in character, architectural shingles, clapboard siding, porches...it's not like you're going to see the side of an Amazon Warehouse.

Mr. Kimball finds two problems with this...one is that it takes a long time to grow a tree high enough to do whatever it is you want it to do; the other thing is the buildings you are proposing are proposed to be 25' closer to the two roads, 31 and Drakes, than are the houses on Oak Brook, either on 31 or on Drakes. You're not as far back as those houses are.

Mr. Sgromo doesn't know about 31, but Oak Brook you're right because those are their backyards. We are up against the building line here and over here slightly pushed back (indicating on plan). Again, we're trying to minimize that disturbance in there. We are fortunate to have a natural buffer. It needs to be supplemented, mainly because of the ash trees and to give it a better mix of trees with something nicer or evergreens to last year round.

Mr. Kimball questioned if there was any chance of making the buildings smaller and moving it back.

Mr. Sgromo smaller no, especially with the loss of that one building. It just becomes cost prohibitive at this point. Two story buildings just don't work financially, by the time you put these elevators in here and all the amenities that make them a nice building you can't do it. They've got garages, they've got elevators, they've got patios, they've got balconies, separate entrances...those cost money and take up space. That's kind of what drives this three-story. If these were bare bones, nothing special, you'd do fine with two-stories but not only would you lose the garage but the amenities that make them special and upscale. It's all trade up on those things. These are very, very nice buildings. I'd recommend that you take a look at the one over at Center Pointe; it's almost the exact same building. They have a lot of different things that add a lot of character to them. A lot goes into these buildings as far as aesthetics go.

Mr. Frateschi posed a question to Mr. Kimball...I'm trying to understand what the main concern is in terms of the visual impact, so are your concerns related to cars driving by and being able to see these; or is it houses on Oak Brook being able to see these?

Mr. Kimball stated that it's all of that.

Mr. Frateschi...just that they will be able to see buildings?

Mr. Kimball stated that when people drive by they see those houses on Oak Brook and they can see them right from 31 and it presents a very positive suburban view, a really nice place to live. And, if you put in these big apartments and have them so close to the road that's going to give a totally different outlook and that's going to appear from the very beginning because I don't care what trees you plant it takes ten, twenty years to grow a tree to be big enough to screen anything.

Mr. Frateschi reiterated that you're saying "the look of a house is significantly different in your opinion or in your aesthetic view".

Mr. Kimball...not only my opinion but in the opinion of the people who live in those houses (several people talking/laughing).

Mr. Frateschi...I get it, but it's ultimately you who are going to be making decisions on the environmental impact of this project and you can represent that when you speak on these issues and clearly unlike traffic, the issue of aesthetics and impacts and how that will have an environmental impact is much more subjective than a traffic impact or a drainage impact or a water impact; but you do have a responsibility under SEQR to make an opinion, I get it, I'm just trying to...is it because they're three-stories high or just because they're bigger buildings?

Mr. Kimball stated that it's all of them together, their height, their proximity to the road the fact that the color combination is not the same as what a homeowner could even build in Radisson.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that his concern would be different, my concern is that there is a visual impact and we should try to minimize it as much as possible and to be quite frank from the roadway to see a suburban neighborhood is not more aesthetically pleasing to me than to look and see an apartment complex. I think the effort should be to try to dampen that impact. It doesn't mean you're hiding the building; you're not making them so that I can not see them, they're not camouflaged, yet it would be nice to soften the visual impact of the development and what we can do to whatever we can do that that is cost effective; but it's not my thought that these need to be hidden from the people. That's where I'm coming from.

Mr. Frateschi stated that that's excellent discussion It's important for us as we go through the SEQR process to understand that Hugh's view, literally and Steve's view might be a little bit different on that specific issue. If buildings are allowed on this site, they're going to be seen by someone.

Mr. Beach stated that you can the houses in Oak Brook right through the trees.

Mr. Lester stated that he believes that landscaping along Drakes Landing would go a long way appeasing the resident's opposition.

Mr. Frateschi stated that that's a very important point and very useful for someone like Mr. Sgromo to hear because that's something that can be done.

Mr. Lester stated that you could also put up a brick wall 50' high that would be very ugly and you wouldn't see the buildings...the goal isn't to block the view of the buildings immediately, but I think the goal ought to be high quality landscaping that is very attractive that adds value to the apartments as well as value to Drakes Landing and neighboring residents.

Mr. Yager added that a berm would bring some relief from a vertical perspective of the grading...it's pretty flat through there.

Mr. Sgromo stated that if we have a 50 or 100 foot area that is going to be bare, I would absolutely agree with you. Put some berming in there with trees around the berm. I would just hate to put berming in places where existing vegetation is. No matter what we do, we go out there and try to survey every tree out there it's not going to give you a good enough picture of what really makes sense of everything. The ideal time to do it is when we're out there...there are a lot of good trees in there that we don't want to take out.

Mr. Yager...Box Elder, Ash has a huge issue right now. I would say the percentage of trees that you're actually going to be able to save is 30 to 40 percent, realistically, of quality trees, not shrubs, not Dogwood, Rose of Sharon.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that if you can preserve 30 to 40 percent of vegetation in a development that's terrific.

Mr. Yager stated that it would not include vegetation, only trees.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they can put a silt fence up right from day one for the limits of grading, rather than trying to dictate where new plantings will go because we can't get in there and do a good enough survey unless the Board wants to walk around with us to say which trees go and which trees stay. There's three, four hundred trees.

Mr. Corey stated that any approval can be conditioned requesting a landscaping plan and walk through as part of that approval. I think it's very clear to you there's several concerns and they all sort of come back to the same issue, one is the view scape and the other is the traffic; but it appears from what we see now traffic could be deemed manageable under your proposal. You already ruled out my simple solution, which is I like what you've got, just make it two story and that solves a lot of things. That's the message we would like you to take back, the Board has some concern about the view scape that sort of drifts to the character, being three story buildings, I know they are allowed in an area in an area where there are no three story buildings around. They're in Radisson, yes...

Mr. Sgromo stated that they're in Timber Banks too; they're not right next to these, I agree.

Mr. Corey stated that what we're looking at and we understand, yes this is zoned for this application, ok, now how do we fix something in there that doesn't change the whole characteristic of the view scape. I think we've had some good discussion but I would still like you to see what more you might do given what we've presented to you so that when we get to our next February meeting and we're doing the SEQR we will be able to address these hopefully in a more affective manner because right now there are still questions.

Mr. Sgromo stated that my personal thought is that we're at the point now where we should get to the public comment because there's going to be more things that will come up, maybe not too many different, but other things that may need to be addressed. We're kind of looking forward to addressing those. I did have a discussion with our client, asking why they can't go to two stories and their comment was if we put a two story in we would have to take out all of the amenities that we have in these apartments that make them as nice as they are that are able to attract the kind of renters that we have. The garages are built right in to the units, the patios, the nice architecture, the stone...all those things that make it look nicer that also fit into their marketing plan would have to go away. Elevators for a three story building can run to almost \$200,000, same elevator for a two story building, now all of a sudden, your cost base is diminished; so now you'd have to start taking things off the table as far as what we could put in those buildings.

Mr. Corey...right, you're specifically targeting a certain market, like the ones up at Center Pointe, the two story, they have no elevators, but they have one feature that many people look for at apartments in apartments which is their own separate entrance.

Mr. Sgromo concurred stating that they have evolved. When they designed these things, they were the cat's meow, everyone loved them.

Mr. Kimball stated that he had a discussion with Mr. Madigan (Brian Madigan, Landscape Architect) and he mentioned the proximity to Kerri Hornaday Park, which I get, but I think of myself as a grandparent to small children, if I were living there I might not want to walk to the Kerri Hornaday, but I would still like to be able to let them out where I could watch them if I were babysitting a grandchild. I don't see that there's any open space, even though it says 47% of the project is open space, where I could do that. Is there anything you can do to fix that?

Mr. Sgromo stated that he will bring it up to them to see if it fits in to their marketing plan, what they find as a need.

Mr. Kimball stated that that is what Mr. Madigan said also, that they could take a look at it, but he's not here today to ask.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they actually do consider what you guys say. I know that playgrounds area liability nightmare.

Mr. Kimball stated that it doesn't have to be a playground. I was looking at the one across the street behind the berm. They have a lot of grassy area around each of the area, some of it is on a hill even, but it's where a kid could go out and fly a kite, do whatever without running into cars in the parking lot.

Mr. Sgromo stated that we have areas in here (indicating on plan) that are not wetlands where you can do stuff. We can look at that...where they can throw a ball back and forth. We can take a look at that, absolutely.

Mr. Kimball concurred stating that he thinks it would make it more attractive to a lot of the people who want to live there, they don't necessarily have to have children, but they may have children that stay with them, or they babysit during the day.

There was some discussion as to whether or not a resolution was required to rescind the former resolution scheduling the Public Hearing as it will not be held within 62 days; however, Karen stated that it's not required as there is no time frame for holding a public hearing outside of subdivisions.

Mr. Frateschi concurred stating that we're not even required to hold a Public Hearing on a site plan, but we're going to. There's not 62 day limit on that.

Mr. Sgromo thanked the Board for their time.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2022—001

Voorhees, David
Gates Road

Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies, represented the applicant, stating that some of the members of the Board should be familiar with this property on Gates Road. Back when we started this project we did a build-out example of what these four lots would look like, four brothers, four lots. In 2014 Kevin Voorhees built on the first lot down by the river that is serviced by a long driveway with turn-outs to allow two way traffic. David and his wife are taking Lot 2 and developing it that for a home for themselves. It's almost three acres in size and will require both a well and sewage disposal system. There are wetlands and a portion is in the NYS Flowage Easement District, but they don't impact this parcel.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that this site, a full build-out plan, already received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for this configuration, as shown.

Steve Darcangelo reiterated that it was approved with no frontage on Gates Road.

Karen Rice, Clerk, concurred stating that they gave them a variance for the lot width for all of the lots because they agreed to build the driveway to Town specifications.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that access easements are to be written to the deeds for each lot. We have these areas in many spots along the Seneca River. This is not anything new to the Town of Lysander. There has to be at least 30 to 40 locations like this along the Seneca River, wouldn't you say, where we have similar lot configurations with long driveways.

Karen concurred stating as well as private road along the riverfront; that that's why we are going to reconsider flag-lots.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that it's poor planning. If it's legitimate I guess I'll vote for it, but it will be a problem down the road. Some day there will be someone sitting in our chairs that will deal with issues related to parcels like this, without a doubt.

Mr. Yager stated that in the ten years he has been here there has only been one instance of somebody on one of these private drives along the river coming to me and it was not about lot issues it was a neighbor issue with somebody burning pallets. Once in the ten years that I've been here.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned why there is not an obligation to just build a public road.

Karen stated that it's built to Town standards...

Mr. Darcangelo concurred but it's still a private road.

Karen stated that the Town doesn't want to maintain it. The owners have a right to develop their property.

Mr. Darcangelo stated...they got a variance so we're going to have to approve it.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned what basis the variance was granted...because there are others that already existed?

Karen concurred stating that we have several throughout the Town.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that now it's easier for the next guy.

Karen concurred on a case by case basis, but yes, a precedence has been set.

The applicant did not complete a Short Environmental Assessment Form as one was done for the build-out of an application that was before the Board in 2014.

The application will be forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation.

RESOLUTION #7 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball.

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held within sixty-two days at a date and time designated by the secretary on application of David Voorhees, for a subdivision of property located at Gates Road, Plainville, New York, Part of Farm Lot Nos. 74 and 84 and Tax Map No. 044.-02-09.3 for the development of two (2) lots from a parcel of approximately 15 ½ acres. Conditioned upon filing a complete application and paying the appropriate fees.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Sehnert thanked the Board at their time.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Major Subdivision—Final Plat | River Grove, Phase II
Lots 23 & 39, Hickory Knoll Lane |
|---------------------------------|---|

Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies, presented plans for Final Plat approval for Lots 23 and 39, part of Phase II of the River Grove subdivision.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that Dan Barnaba, Eldan Homes, was before the Board two months ago seeking preliminary plat approval. These are the two lots that front the existing roadway and will be serviced by utilities on the existing roadway. Access will be from Hickory Knoll Land and not Tulip Tree.

John Corey, Chairman, questioned if anything has changed since the preliminary plat was approved.

Mr. Yager stated that nothing has changed.

Steve Darcangelo stated that often Al gives a letter for this situation.

Mr. Yager stated that this is very fresh in the Boards mind and is the same thing that was considered a couple months ago.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated stating that there's no significant change from what was originally proposed.

RESOLUTION #8 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat, for the River Grove, Phase II, subdivision application of Eldan Homes, for property located at Lot 23 and 39, Hickory Knoll Lane, Baldwinsville, New York, Part of Military Lot No. 61 and Part of Tax Map No. 081.2-01-01.1 and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat public hearing and sign the Final Plat.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Sehnert thanked the Board for their time.

VI. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #9 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the Thursday, January 13, 2022 regular Planning Board meeting adjourn at 8:29 p.m.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk